

In the United States Court of Federal Claims
OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS
Filed: January 29, 2020

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
MILAN SEDLACEK, * No. 17-1226V
Petitioner, * Special Master Sanders
*
*
* v. *
*
*
SECRETARY OF HEALTH * Attorneys' Fees and Costs
AND HUMAN SERVICES, *
*
* Respondent. *
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Ronald C. Homer, Conway, Homer, P.C., Boston, MA, for Petitioner.

Daniel A. Principato, United States Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

DECISION ON ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS¹

On September 11, 2017, Milan Sedlacek ("Petitioner") filed a petition for compensation pursuant to the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program.² 42 U.S.C. §§ 300aa-10 to 34 (2012). The petition alleged that the influenza ("flu") vaccine Petitioner received on October 8, 2014, caused him to develop Chronic Inflammatory Demyelinating Polyneuropathy ("CIDP"). On July 26, 2019, the parties filed a stipulation, which the undersigned adopted as her decision awarding compensation on July 29, 2019. ECF No. 43.

On October 1, 2019, Petitioner filed an application for attorneys' fees and costs. ECF No. 48 ("Fees App."). Petitioner requests total attorneys' fees and costs in the amount of \$26,160.53

¹ The undersigned intends to post this Ruling on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website. **This means the ruling will be available to anyone with access to the Internet.** In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, the undersigned agrees that the identified material fits within this definition, the undersigned will redact such material from public access. Because this unpublished ruling contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, the undersigned is required to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2012) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services).

² National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all "§" references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2012).

(representing \$24,343.70 in fees and \$1,800.83 in costs). Fees App. at 1-2. Pursuant to General Order No. 9, Petitioner warrants that he has personally incurred \$16.00 in costs. Fees App. at 2. Respondent responded to the motion on October 7, 2019, indicating that he “is satisfied the statutory requirements for an award of attorneys’ fees and costs are met in this case” and requesting that the undersigned “exercise her discretion and determine a reasonable award for attorneys’ fees and costs.” Resp’t’s Resp. at 2–3 (ECF No. 50). Petitioner did not file a reply thereafter.

This matter is now ripe for consideration.

I. Reasonable Attorneys’ Fees and Costs

The Vaccine Act permits an award of reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs. § 15(e). The Federal Circuit has approved the lodestar approach to determine reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs under the Vaccine Act. *Avera v. Sec’y of Health & Human Servs.*, 515 F.3d 1343, 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2008). This is a two-step process. *Id.* First, a court determines an “initial estimate . . . by ‘multiplying the number of hours reasonably expended on the litigation times a reasonable hourly rate.’” *Id.* at 1347–48 (quoting *Blum v. Stenson*, 465 U.S. 886, 888 (1984)). Second, the court may make an upward or downward departure from the initial calculation of the fee award based on specific findings. *Id.* at 1348.

It is “well within the special master’s discretion” to determine the reasonableness of fees. *Saxton v. Sec’y of Health & Human Servs.*, 3 F.3d 1517, 1521–22 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *see also Hines v. Sec’y of Health & Human Servs.*, 22 Cl. Ct. 750, 753 (1991). (“[T]he reviewing court must grant the special master wide latitude in determining the reasonableness of both attorneys’ fees and costs.”). Applications for attorneys’ fees must include contemporaneous and specific billing records that indicate the work performed and the number of hours spent on said work. *See Savin v. Sec’y of Health & Human Servs.*, 85 Fed. Cl. 313, 316–18 (2008). Such applications, however, should not include hours that are ““excessive, redundant, or otherwise unnecessary.”” *Saxton*, 3 F.3d at 1521 (quoting *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 434 (1983)).

Reasonable hourly rates are determined by looking at the “prevailing market rate” in the relevant community. *See Blum*, 465 U.S. at 895. The “prevailing market rate” is akin to the rate “in the community for similar services by lawyers of reasonably comparable skill, experience and reputation.” *Id.* at 895, n.11. Petitioners bear the burden of providing adequate evidence to prove that the requested hourly rate is reasonable. *Id.*

a. Hourly Rates

The decision in *McCulloch* provides a framework for consideration of appropriate ranges for attorneys’ fees based upon the experience of the practicing attorney. *McCulloch v. Sec’y of Health & Human Servs.*, No. 09-293V, 2015 WL 5634323, at *19 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Sept. 1, 2015), *motion for recons. denied*, 2015 WL 6181910 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Sept. 21, 2015). The Court has since updated the *McCulloch* rates, and the Attorneys’ Forum Hourly Rate Fee Schedules for 2015–2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019 can be accessed online.³

³ The 2015–2016 Fee Schedule can be accessed at:
<http://www.cofc.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/Attorneys-Forum-Rate-Fee-Schedule2015-2016.pdf>. The

The undersigned has reviewed the requested rates for the work of Petitioner's counsel at Conway, Homer, P.C. (the records indicate that the majority of attorney work was performed by Ms. Christina Ciampolillo, with supporting work done by Mr. Ronald Homer, Mr. Joseph Pepper, Ms. Lauren Faga, and Ms. Meredith Daniels) and finds that the rates sought herein are consistent with what counsel have previously been awarded for their Vaccine Program work. The rates are also reasonable for the work done in the instant case and therefore no reduction is necessary.

b. Hours Expended

Attorneys' fees are awarded for the "number of hours reasonably expended on the litigation." *Avera*, 515 F.3d at 1348. Counsel should not include in their fee requests hours that are "excessive, redundant, or otherwise unnecessary." *Saxton*, 3 F.3d at 1521.

Upon review, the undersigned finds the billed hours to be reasonable. Counsel has provided sufficiently detailed descriptions for the tasks performed, and upon review the undersigned does not find any of the billing entries to be unreasonable. Respondent has also not indicated that he finds any of the billing entries to be unreasonable. Accordingly, Petitioner is entitled to final attorneys' fees in the amount of **\$24,343.70**.

c. Attorneys' Costs

Like attorneys' fees, a request for reimbursement of attorneys' costs must be reasonable. *Perreira v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 27 Fed. Cl. 29, 34 (Fed. Cl. 1992). Petitioner requests a total of \$1,800.83 in attorneys' costs. This amount is comprised of acquiring medical records, postage, the Court's filing fee, and costs associated with a client visit. Fees App. at 20-21. Petitioner has provided adequate documentation to support these costs and in the undersigned's experience they are reasonable. Accordingly, Petitioner is entitled to the full amount of costs sought.

d. Petitioner's Costs

Pursuant to General Order No. 9, Petitioner states that he has personally incurred costs of \$16.00 for acquisition of medical records. Fees App. at 47. Petitioner has supported this cost and it shall be reimbursed.

II. Conclusion

2017 Fee Schedule can be accessed at: <http://www.cofc.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/Attorneys-Forum-Rate-Fee-Schedule-2017.pdf>. The 2018 Fee Schedule can be accessed at:
<http://www.cofc.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/Attorneys%27%20Forum%20Rate%20Fee%20Schedule%202018.pdf>. The 2019 Fee Schedule can be accessed at:
<http://www.cofc.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/Attorneys%27%20Forum%20Rate%20Fee%20Schedule%202019.pdf>. The hourly rates contained within the schedules are updated from the decision in *McCulloch*, 2015 WL 5634323.

Based on all the above, the undersigned finds that Petitioner is entitled to the following award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs:

Attorneys' Fees Requested	\$24,343.70
(Reduction to Fees)	-
Total Attorneys' Fees Awarded	\$24,343.70
Attorneys' Costs Requested	\$1,800.83
(Reduction of Costs)	-
Total Attorneys' Costs Awarded	\$1,800.83
Total Attorneys' Fees and Costs	\$26,144.53
Petitioner's Costs	\$16.00
Total Amount Awarded	\$26,160.53

In accordance with the Vaccine Act, 42 U.S.C. § 300aa-15(e) (2012), the undersigned has reviewed the billing records and costs in this case and finds that Petitioner's request for fees and costs is reasonable. Accordingly, the undersigned awards the following:

- 1) A lump sum in the amount of \$26,144.53, representing reimbursement for Petitioner's attorneys' fees and costs, in the form of a check payable to Petitioner and his attorney, Mr. Ronald Homer; and
- 2) A lump sum in the amount of \$16.00, representing reimbursement for Petitioner's costs, in the form of a check payable to Petitioner.

In the absence of a motion for review filed pursuant to RCFC Appendix B, the Clerk of the Court shall enter judgment in accordance herewith.⁴

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Herbrina D. Sanders
 Herbrina D. Sanders
 Special Master

⁴ Entry of judgment can be expedited by each party's filing of a notice renouncing the right to seek review. Vaccine Rule 11(a).